

Document 31, Tri-City Industrial Development Council (Harold Heacock), Kennewick, WA  
Page 2 of 2

- 31-9  
11.E(6) • Any offsite wastes which are processed or vitrified in the plant must be returned to the sender or to a national repository. Interim or permanent disposal of the wastes at Hanford is not acceptable.]
- 31-10  
11.E(3) • Full funding for all transportation, processing, and storage costs must be provided as an added increment to Hanford Environmental Management funding.]
- 31-11  
VIII.H(3) • Consideration must be given to local environmental impacts resulting from the transportation and processing of the Idaho wastes.]
- 31-12  
VIII.H(3) • Offsite transportation corridor safety, environmental impacts, and traffic issues must be thoroughly reviewed in cooperation with local and tribal governments.] Provision must be made to alleviate any additional costs which may be incurred by local and state government agencies.]
- 31-13  
11.E(3)
- 31-14  
11.E(4) We believe that these issues are reasonable requirements that provide a bottom line basis for evaluation at the importation of high level wastes to Hanford for processing and vitrification. In view of the potential significant savings from the Hanford alternative that would accrue to the Department as compared to other feasible alternatives, this alternative should be given a more comprehensive evaluation than is currently available.]

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views on this subject.

Document 32, U.S. Department of Commerce (Susan B. Fruchter), Washington, D.C.  
Page 1 of 2

Feb 28 00 11:10a

EH-421

202 586-7031

p. 2



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Office of the Under Secretary for  
Oceans and Atmosphere  
Washington, D.C. 20230  
EIS PROJECT - AR/PF  
HLW & FD Control # DC-32

February 16, 2000

Ms. Carol M. Borgstrom, Director  
Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance  
Department of Energy  
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Ms. Borgstrom:

Enclosed are comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Idaho High-Level Waste and Facilities Disposition Boise, Idaho. We hope our comments can assist you. Thank you for giving us an opportunity to review this document.

Sincerely,

*Susan Fruchter*

Susan B. Fruchter  
Acting NEPA Coordinator

Enclosure

FEB 23 2000

EH-42



MEMORANDUM FOR: Susan B. Fruchter  
Acting NEPA Coordinator

FROM: Charles W. Challstrom  
Acting Director, National Geodetic Survey

SUBJECT: DEIS-0002-01 Idaho High-Level Waste and Facilities Disposition,  
Boise, Idaho

The subject statement has been reviewed within the areas of the National Geodetic Survey's (NGS) responsibility and expertise and in terms of the impact of the proposed actions on NGS activities and projects.

32-1  
VIII.F(1) [All available geodetic control information about horizontal and vertical geodetic control monuments in the subject area is contained on the NGS home page at the following Internet World Wide Web address: <http://www.ngs.noaa.gov>. After entering the NGS home page, please access the topic "Products and Services" and then access the menu item "Data Sheet." This menu item will allow you to directly access geodetic control monument information from the NGS data base for the subject area project. This information should be reviewed for identifying the location and designation of any geodetic control monuments that may be affected by the proposed project.

32-2  
VIII.F(1) If there are any planned activities which will disturb or destroy these monuments, NGS requires not less than 90 days' notification in advance of such activities in order to plan for their relocation. [NGS recommends that funding for this project includes the cost of any relocation(s) required.]

For further information about these monuments, please contact Rick Yorczyk; SSMC3 8636, NOAA, N/NGS; 1315 East West Highway; Silver Spring, Maryland 20910; telephone: 301-713-3230 x142; fax: 301-713-4175.

W. Brad DeBow  
2238 West 1000 South  
Rexburg, Idaho 83440-3754

February 25, 2000

Attn: Idaho HLW & FD EIS  
c/o: T. L. Wichmann, Document Director  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Idaho Operations Office  
850 Energy Drive, Mail Stop: 1108  
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401-1563

HLW & FD



EIS PROJECT - AR/Ff  
Control # DC-33

Dear Sir:

33-1  
VIII.D(1) I would like to submit the following comment on the Idaho HLW & FD EIS. This comment applies to the selection of a final option that both the State of Idaho and the DOE can agree on, and to three of the alternatives listed in the EIS that will be able to gain this joint agreement if my comment on the upgrade of the NWCF Calciner is accepted. [The three options to which I wish to comment are the Separations Alternative Planning Basis Option, the Non-Separations Alternative Hot Isostatic Pressed Option, and the Non-Separations Alternative Direct Cement Waste Option.]

33-2  
VIII.D(1) These three options all involve pre-treatment of the liquid tank farm waste with the NWCF Calciner. This pre-treatment is the only way that the Settlement Agreement requirement of having the Sodium Bearing Waste (SBW) removed from the tank farm by 2012 has a chance of being met. It is my opinion and my input to this process that this portion of the Settlement Agreement must be complied with whichever option is finally selected. [The liquid waste is by far the most hazardous of the various forms of waste] and the State of Idaho was correct in insisting this form be eliminated by the soonest possible date, which is 2012. As a citizen of the area near where that liquid waste is stored, I cannot emphasize enough my comment that the 2012 date previously agreed to in a court ordered Settlement Agreement with the State of Idaho must be complied with.

33-3  
VIII.C(1) It appears to me that this EIS process is being used as a vehicle to abrogate the Settlement Agreement with the State of Idaho. Specifically, it appears that the compliance with the 2012 date for the conversion of the liquid waste to a solid form is at risk. The EIS states that it would be difficult to stop using the tank farm by 2012. Oddly enough, the State of Idaho itself seems responsible for this attempted abrogation of responsibility through its insistence on the requirement to permit and MACT upgrade the Calciner. This permit and upgrade step is written in to every option in which the Calciner would be used to pre-treat the liquid waste. [The cost, in both dollars and more importantly time, to accomplish the MACT upgrade on the Calciner is not acceptable.] [The options that involve running the Calciner must be considered without the permit and MACT upgrade aspects. This would allow the Calciner to continue operation after June 1, 2000 and accomplish the most critical aspect of the Settlement Agreement, the elimination of the liquid SBW by 2012.]

- New Information -

Idaho HLW & FD EIS

D-43

DOE/EIS-0287